



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

consulting formally or informally the leading professors in the subject and without making sure that most of them approve of it, is taking a grave responsibility that can be justified only by a condition that requires surgery. The objection to a formal nomination by a faculty, or a committee thereof, is that it places the members in an uncomfortable position in regard to their younger colleagues, and that it creates a tendency for the promotion of useful rather than excellent men. A wise president will not make nominations without being sure of the support of the instructing staff, but he may properly, and indeed ought, to decline to make nominations unless convinced that the nominee is of the caliber that ought to be appointed.

"Attempts have been made to define, and express in written rules, the relation between the faculties and the governing boards; but the best element in that relation is an intangible, an undefinable, influence. If husband and wife should attempt to define by regulations their respective rights and duties in the household, that marriage could safely be pronounced a failure. The essence of the relation is mutual confidence and mutual regard; and the respective functions of the faculties and the governing boards—those things that each had better undertake, those it had better leave to the other, and those which require mutual concession—are best learned from experience and best embodied in tradition. Tradition has great advantages over regulations. It is a more delicate instrument; it accommodates itself to things that are not susceptible of sharp definition; it is more flexible in its application, making exceptions and allowances which it would be difficult to foresee or prescribe. It is also more stable. Regulations can be amended; tradition cannot, for it is not made, but grows, and can be altered only by a gradual change in general opinion, not by a majority vote. In short, it cannot be amended, but only outgrown."

THE FUNCTIONS OF THE FACULTY IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF A UNIVERSITY.—Extracts from an address at the inauguration of the President of the University of Michigan:

". . . To enter immediately into the heart of the subject, I beg to call attention first to the fact that the functions actually exercised by faculties in good and progressive institutions in the determination of university policies and their execution is much

larger than the functions legally delegated to faculties by the constitutions and by-laws of universities in general. As a rule, faculties are legally empowered chiefly to deal with the governance of the curriculum and student body. *In fact*, they are frequently called upon to discuss and make recommendations upon matters of educational policy. They are normally consulted as to new appointments, they are consulted to a large extent in the choice of deans, and to some extent in the choice of presidents. They are frequently given a hearing on the matter of salary scale. Thus, to a large and growing extent, faculties enjoy the substance of participation in administration without its legal forms.

"The main contention of this address is that the actual usages and tendencies of the best institutions in this regard should be more explicitly legalized in the constitutions and by-laws of universities. As a matter of history it seems to be undoubtedly the case that when, in the not very remote past, there were in America no large universities serving multifarious interests, when the elder among our present great universities were like the small colleges of to-day in curricula, aims and numbers, the faculties exercised much larger administrative functions. The older American college was more or less like a large family. The professors and the students knew each other; the professors and the trustees knew each other, and the alumni were known to all the older members of the faculty. The growth in numbers and in the complexity of educational concerns and aims, have perforce, brought to pass a greater administrative specialization as well as a greater curricular specialization. The growth of higher education is parallel here to the industrial development. Without doubt, this specialization of function has been developed in the interests of economy of effort and productive efficiency. The great problem in education, as in industry, is to harmonize administrative efficiency in large concerns with that humane value of self-determination and self-respect, in the life of the worker, without which his work will surely deteriorate in quality. We hear, on all hands, of the demands of the industrial worker for a voice in the control of the industry. I do not think that the parallelism between industry and higher education can be carried out on all fours; but, inasmuch as the work of higher education is wrought by mind on mind, and material instruments are here wholly subordinate to life interests, insofar as the parallelism in ques-

tion breaks down, it does so in favor of the resumption of a greater measure of control by the faculty in administration. The professor deals with the mind as a living unity and, therefore, should always consider his own work as an element in the whole educational process; whereas the industrial worker may make a rivet or bore a hole without taking account of the making of the whole machine. I wish to insist most strongly that no good educator can be a mere pigeon-hole specialist or pure departmentalist.

"In good institutions, faculties do then informally participate to a large extent in university administration, but, without the constitutional forms to protect it, the substance of healthy faculty participation in administration may vanish at any time when a governing board succumbs to extraneous influences inimical to the nurture of the highest quality of instruction and research. These influences may come from the unenlightened interests of portions of the general public, of the alumni, or from the lack of high educational standards and moral courage in the president as well as in the governing board, or from several or all of these sources. To be specific on one point, it is certainly not conducive to an improvement in the morale and personnel of the faculty when a small body of laymen, themselves incompetent to evaluate teaching and productive ability, and acting solely on the advice of a president who may be neither a great scholar or educator, nor a sound judge of scholarship, can determine, without regard to the judgments of those who have expert knowledge, not only the economic and academic fates of genuine productive scholars and teachers but, as well, the fundamental policies of the institution in which these scholars and teachers must do their work. . . .

"The question of the powers of faculties with regard to tenure and procedure in dismissals is a knotty one. I do not believe that, in the present transitional phase of our higher education, we can afford to accept, without qualification, the dogma of life tenure for professors. Mistakes in election are sometimes made. They should be rectified, even though their rectification works hardship to individuals, since failure to rectify them works immeasurable injury to numbers of plastic and gifted minds—the select youth who constitute the greatest riches and the most radiant promise of the body social. We professors must, as a corporate body and as individuals, always be ready to have the

status of our vocation and its social evaluation determined by the contribution which we are making to the upbuilding of the living minds of the new generation. If a faculty be competent, if it deserve the name of university faculty, it should participate in administration; insofar as it may be incompetent, its house should be set in order, by concerted action. For this reason I believe that the final power of appointment and dismissal should continue to rest with the governing board, subject to the provisos stated below. On the other hand, the right of the faculty to participate, in judgment and determination upon cases of dismissal, is essential to the safeguarding of proper academic freedom. No body of laymen can be safely intrusted with the sole power to determine, even with the advice of the president, the nature and limits of freedom of teaching. In the majority of cases where dismissals have been made by trustees alone during the past few years the causes have been chiefly either economic, ethical, political or other forms of heresy or insubordination. The mentally inert and stupid, the lazy or otherwise incompetent on the faculty, have rarely been disturbed by the governing boards. I regret to say that boards, and sometimes faculties too, often suffer amiable morons more gladly than marked nonconformist individualities. The university that has no heretics on its faculty is a dead one.

"Universities should not be run as mere business concerns. The election of a professor is a step that should not be taken unadvisedly or lightly, but soberly and discreetly. When the institution has made a mistake it should accept the responsibility and share the burden of the mistake. The status of a professor should be, normally, one of high dignity, security and permanence. It can not be made a very gainful occupation. Only through dignity and security in the calling can we insure good men and good work. Therefore, no professor should be summarily dismissed, nor without the opportunity of a full investigation by a jury of his peers. If it be the final decision that he is unfit to continue in office, then he should have at least a year's notice and leave of absence with salary to enable him to find a more suitable place. Possibly the time is not far distant when, by the general elevation of the standard for the profession, it will be safe to accord generally a life tenure. But, taking the country as a whole, that time is not yet. . . .

"If there is to be any distinction in dignity and power, the faculty should be the upper house; the governing board might be regarded as a standing committee of the Commons as well as the property-holding corporation for the Commons (which is the public). The president is the coordinator and harmonizer of the views of the other bodies. It may be said that the faculty is engaged to teach, and, if its members have any time and energy left, to investigate and write; but its primary business is to do the job it is hired to do and in the way in which the governing board, out of its wisdom in interpreting the public demands, sees fit to dictate, just as a bricklayer is hired to lay bricks without criticizing the purpose or architecture of the edifice. This view of the faculty's function has found frequent expression in reputable journals and is held by some citizens and possibly by a few trustees; but I have no time to waste in debating with anybody who puts the work of the faculty in the same category as that of janitors and clerks. Persons who hold such views have not the faintest inkling of the meaning and purpose of a university. A faculty may be wrong—"To err is human"—but if a faculty is not more competent to decide upon the wisdom or integrity of the deeds of its executives, if it is not better fitted to determine whether the actual administrative conditions are a help or a hindrance to the performance of its own public services than any body of laymen, then the institution is not a real university. The incompetence of the faculty reflects the failure of the governing board and the administration, and if the institution is not a real university it needs to be either wiped out of existence or cleaned thoroughly from cellar to garret. It needs scarcely to be said that the general discussion of this paper does not apply to such institutions. Concluding this brief résumé of the various administrative functions of the faculty, I would again enter a plea for open-minded discussion and experimentation.

"Fuller constitutional recognition of the rights and duties of the faculty in administration are herein advocated chiefly on two grounds which are interdependent; namely, improvement in the faculty personnel and morale, and improvement in the quality of their services to society. Notwithstanding the great and rapid growth in universities, in numbers of students, teachers and graduates, and in productive output, it is obvious to any well-informed

observer, that we have not been getting the results we might get. No doubt the universities will exert an ever increasing, and, on the whole, a bettering influence on American life. In spite of the omnipotence of governing boards, the reputed omniscience of presidents, the ineptitude of faculty meetings and the extraordinary immunity of undergraduates to intellectual infection, we must have *faith* in education, for, 'Faith is the evidence of things not seen, the substance of things hoped for.' But we are only scratching the surface of the educational possibilities, and we are not even scratching the surface very thoroughly. Various forms of extra-curricular, student activities arouse on the part of many of the student body a keener interest than the work of classroom, library and laboratory. The fact that the side shows are of more interest to many students than the main circus is partial evidence, at least, of the failure of the ring-masters and performers in the main circus. If a large proportion of lively youth are not intrigued by the business of higher education, there is something wrong with the conduct of this business. Too large a proportion of our university teachers appear to students to be ineffective molly-coddles. We sorely need to make the professorate a man-sized job, not a sailor's snugharbor for persons of neuter gender. There is a faint color of truth in the saying, 'There are three sexes, men, women and teachers.' We must have a more dynamic type of university teacher and investigator, teachers with more vigorous and inspiring personalities, with more mental initiative, teachers who are not satisfied to go through the motions of classroom work and imitation research. In short, our profession has not succeeded in recruiting a sufficient proportion of the first rate native minds that are born in every generation. How shall we do better? For one thing, I am sure we must establish more striking differentials in salary scales. We must make it possible for really able men to win decent incomes in the profession, incomes that will compete in attractiveness, when there is added to them the other delights of the profession, with those enjoyed by leading members of other professions, such as medicine, law, engineering and even business. It is not part of my province to discuss the salary question, but I wish to say that while higher salaries are necessary, they will not be enough. Self-determination is a hackneyed word to-day, but it is a good word. The professors are either the best educa-

tional experts of the country, or else they are hollow shams. If we are to have men of vigor and initiative practising the profession of handing on to the new generation the accrued achievements of the higher civilization, and of adding to these achievements, we must order the operation of our universities, so that, in all matters that vitally touch the practise of university teaching and research, those who are the experts will have the freest field possible to function effectively as experts. It is disheartening enough and it lames efficiency not to be able to make a decent livelihood in the practise of a profession than which there is none more essential to the ongoing and improvement of civilization; but it is still more disheartening and still more lames efficiency when the competent professor sees, and is powerless to prevent, the dilution and cheapening of the educational work of the institution through its succumbing to the ever imminent and insistent pressure to spread out its work over more and more ill-prepared and unpurposeful students, and to see the institution rush hastily, without adequate equipment and personnel, into new educational enterprises. One of the curses of higher education in this country to-day is the apparent worship by the public, alumni, governing boards and administrators, yes, and tell it not in Gath, publish it not in Gilead, the worship, even by professors, of the golden calf of quantity production. The most serious menace to the maintenance or improvement of the qualitative standards of higher education to-day comes from the ever-rising flood of freshmen. Faculties seem to be powerless in the face of this menace. The situation is especially alarming in the state universities. Legislatures, being without knowledge, do not appreciate the situation; the governing boards face it only intermittently, namely in trying to find the money for new instructors; the faculties are face-to-face with it every day; privately they groan over it, publicly they are passive and silent; theirs not to reason why, theirs but to teach and die. The numbers roll up, the courses multiply by fission, like the lower organisms; universities rush to get cheap and inexperienced teachers who sometimes are not even worth the pittance they are paid, to turn out ever growing hordes of graduates who have amassed the correct number of credit slips, but who have no clear idea of scholarly or scientific method, no real insight into the meaning of education, no exacting standards of thought and taste. The in-

rush of hordes of unselected and badly prepared students has its touching aspect. It is in part at least an expression of the yearning of our democracy for spiritual development and of a blind faith in the mystic power of education to transmute the soul of youth by some alchemy or magic into nobler and worthier life. But we do disservice to democracy when we fail to exercise rigorously the process of selection by which only those qualified by nature and nurture are chosen to be the responsive subjects of university education. We must get rid of that democratic form of sentimentality which ignores the inexorable fact that in every generation, by the operation of the blind forces of nature or by the will of God (call it what you will, it matters not), only a small minority of the youth have the native capacity for acquiring the highest degree of education. To dissipate our energies and our resources in the universities in catering to every comer is to do injustice to the more gifted, and in the long run to our democracy. For we fail to train up leaders, and we foster the illusion on the part of the many that they are getting a higher education.

"I recognize that a considerable proportion of our faculty members are not fit to do things any better than they are now doing. I recognize that some of them are not now fit to pass balanced and wise judgments on matters of educational policy. It is a day of confusion and unrest in education, as in the body politic. The children are come to the birth and there is not strength to bear them. But I do not see how we can expect to make our universities more effectual ministrants of a higher civilization, unless we can make them better nurturing grounds for that aristocracy of intelligence, character and taste, of which democracy stands in such sore need, for its leaders and exemplars everywhere in public life—in politics, in art, letters, the drama, social philosophy and practise. We are living in an era which has made jettison of inherited standards of thought, conduct and social order; and has as yet brought forth no new, more organic and coherent standards to take their place. We have not, and we do not want, a hereditary aristocracy based on vested privileges and legal and economic injustice. We have not, but we sorely need and must develop, if our civilization is to endure and progress, a spiritual élite, an aristocracy imbued with the sense of service, of noblesse oblige; one which is ever being built

up to the highest point of power by the selection of those with the best native capacities, and by the intensive training of these superior native capacities to the highest point possible. It is the function of the university to be in the fullest sense the transmitter of culture, the initiator of the selected in every generation into a comprehensive and balanced consciousness of the creative meaning of civilization, into a recognition of the cardinal fact that civilization is made and renewed and enhanced just in the degree in which the heritage of culture quickens, nurtures, and expands the individual mind; where else can this work be done if not in the university? Where are we to look for sound judgment and wise insight, for unprejudiced facing of facts, for the fresh determination of facts and their interpretation in terms of human values if not to the university men? We certainly can not look for it in the market place, in the popular journals, or on the political rostrum. Can the blind lead the blind? Can the natural élite become, by intensive cultivation, the educated élite, if they are taught by persons who are themselves incapable of seeing and kindling to the great vocation of the university teacher, as the custodian of the rational and spiritual interests of civilization? How can we expect a more virile and creative type of teacher and scholar if he is to have no effective part in determining the conditions under which he works? I would put the plea for greater faculty participation in university affairs then, not on the ground that it will make us more at ease in Zion; but on the ground that it will increase our burdens and responsibilities; and may thereby enable us to grow up to our tasks, may nerve us to be more effective participants in the perpetuation and improvement of civilization. If I am right in contending that the conservation and progress of the higher civilization in America depends chiefly on the universities, it follows that any proposed change in the method of conducting university affairs should be tried by this test: Will it, or will it not, make the universities more effective instruments for the conservation of whatsoever is worth conserving in the culture of the past, and for the increase of that culture by new insights in science, letters, art, social thought and practise; will it be more effective in the selection and functioning of a better personnel? The university exists to serve the mass, not directly, but indirectly by conserving and improving the best instruments of

culture, not by taking its culture from the mass. It can not do this unless its daily work is carried on by a vigorous, competent, self-respecting personnel. Its task is more exacting, perhaps, than that of any other institution in our civilization. Time was when the church was the chief custodian of a higher civilization. That time has long since gone by. Time was when in an hereditary aristocracy resided the custodianship of culture. That time too has gone by. Democracy is in the saddle and does not know whither it is riding. Unless it supports and nurtures an institution which can find a way and lead it, democracy is riding to a bad fall. This institution for democracy is the university. My argument for more recognized participation by the faculty in administration has, as its central thesis, the belief that this change would be a means by which the members of the faculty might grow up to a keener sense of their great tasks, and develop more strength to discharge them. Our supreme functions are, as I have indicated, to be the conservators and the improvers of human culture: That is to say, of culture as a means for the improvement of the human race. It is only as conscious of the difficulty and the worthiness of our tasks as servants of the common-weal, that we should ask for anything. We should ask for a more effective participation in the direction of university policies only that thereby we may be freer to serve more effectively the whole of society by better conserving, transmitting and improving the cultural implements for the perfection of man."—*Joseph A. Leighton, Ohio State University.*

THE AMERICAN OXONIAN.—Volume 8, No. 1, January, 1921, gives an interesting statistical survey of the record of the American Rhodes Scholarships from 1904 to 1916. The general result may be inferred from the editorial following:

"We have examined in considerable detail the facts of the record of the American Rhodes Scholars so far as these facts are capable of summary in statistics of the type used. It is now appropriate to survey the record from a broader point of view and see what light, if any, they shed on general questions in regard to the Rhodes Scholarships. Has the scheme, for instance, realized the expectations of the Founder? If not, have the scholarships justified themselves in other ways? Rhodes planned